January 1998
TRIPLE R

NO MORE WARS

Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.

Another month, another foreign enemy. No sooner had Washington's war party completed its hysterical attempt to demonize China–calling its burgeoning prosperity a threat to world peace–than it featured another country in the bulletin of the War-of-the-Month club.

This month's selection is Iraq. It seems that Saddam Hussein is more than a little resistant to U.S. demands, among them that U2 spy planes should be able to fly around his country at the whim of the State Department. Hussein, you see, has the temerity to object to this, even threatening to toss a few of his outdated missiles at these planes.

And talk about paranoid. Hussein also objects to having U.S. officials snooping around his country for evidence of nuclear capacity. How unreasonable. To hear Hussein talk, you would think the U.S. had it in for Iraq.

It was six years ago that the U.S. went to war with Iraq over its border dispute with Kuwait, and pounded Iraq into submission. It was the last hurrah of the Cold War mode, as George Bush tried, and failed, to ride his victory to a second term. Did former U.S. ally Hussein resent the U.S. attack? Of course, since he had been given official assurance that the U.S. would wink at his move against Kuwait, by U.S. Ambassador to Iraq April Glaspie.

The Gulf War was a gruesome conflict that the U.S. won handily and expensively. But the world's only superpower is not the most gracious of victors. Instead of allowing normalcy to be restored, the U.S. has retained wartime embargoes, forbidding the export of oil and the import of medicine and food, while pressuring countries around the world to do the same.

This has amounted to an attempt to starve out Iraq, and it has resulted in massive malnutrition, disease, and poverty, with the UN's own reports indicating that a million people have died, mostly children and the elderly. Not all is fair in war, and a six-year-old policy to destroy an entire people because we don't like their leader is not the way civilized nations conduct their business.

When faced with this exterminationist approach to post-Gulf War diplomacy, Iraq has been remarkably compliant. It allows UN inspectors to roam its country searching anywhere they please for nuclear weapons. Earlier this year, UN inspectors even invaded a convent of Catholic nuns, breaking down the front door and violating graves in their efforts to discover Iraq's elusive nuclear weapons.

Even so, Iraq did not demand that all inspectors leave its country. It did not forbid planes with aerial cameras from looking around the place. What Hussein wanted was that the foreign government that buried Iraqi soldiers alive in mountains of sand, and favors a policy of starvation over peaceful engagement, not fly *its* spy planes and not make *its* bureaucrats part of the inspection teams.

Saddam Hussein is, in other words, demanding what every American who cares about freedom should also be demanding: that the U.S. get out of Iraq.

continued on page 4

INSIDE

Intelligence Briefing 2
Disinformation and the War on the Family 4
MICHAEL LEVIN
Ranking Presidents 6
PAUL GOTTFRIED
Beyond All *Reason* 7
PHYLLIS SPIVEY
A Manifesto for Our Times 8
L.H.R., JR.
Free Fall 10
L.H.R., JR.
The Right Prize for Peace 15
L.H.R., JR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INTELLIGENCE BRIEFING

♦ At a White House conference on hate crimes, Clinton was rattled by a protestor who shouted: "You murdered Vince Foster. Is that a hate crime?" After a long pause, Clinton said, "I think the hate is coming from your way, not mine." At least now we have a clear definition of hate: thinking the government is up to no good. (*Washington Times*, Nov. 11, 1997)

♦ **Go, Murray!** Congratulations to Murray Sabrin, the Austrian economist who ran for governor of New Jersey on the Libertarian ticket. Not only did he organize brilliantly, raise –for a third-party candidate–huge sums of money, but he also got into the televised debates and received tremendous publicity and up to 10% in the polls. Murray was ignored by the official LP establishment because he ran as a right-winger (pro-life, pro-English, and anti-welfare for immigrants, as well as anti-tax and anti-regulation). Governor Christie Whitman offered Murray a high post in her cabinet if he would drop out and endorse her. Murray Sabrin, of course, said no.

♦ **The heroic Matt Drudge** of the Internet's *Drudge Report* has recently been reminding his readers of the following three quotations, especially notable in light of the war fever against Iraq: "What I'm trying to do is to promote a process of reorganization of the world...."–Clinton, interview with Argentine reporters, Oct. 17, 1997. "Today, I say that no nation in the world need be left out of the global system we are constructing...."–Madeline Albright, Commencement Address, Harvard, June 5, 1997. "I have an enormous personal ambition. I want to shift the entire planet. And I'm doing it....–Newt Gingrich, *Washington Post*, Jan. 3, 1995.

♦ **"What women's lib achieved was to make women throw away the Bible,"** says British romance novelist Dame Barbara Cartland. "Where we had morality in the home, the village, the town, and over most of England, we now have wife-swapping in small towns and many other unpleasant sexual pastimes." Women's lib has "resulted in little girls of 15 being bullied at school because they have not had sex. We now have, at this moment, the worst child abuse of any country in the world. The ghastly crimes inflicted on children are usually done by the stepfather or the live-in lover." It is going to be "a long and hard task to undo the terrible harm which has been done by women's lib and the permissive era." (London *Sunday Times*, Nov. 9, 1997)

♦ **Lots of venom has been heaped on speculators** in recent days, but remember this: they are only speculators. That means, they are making guesses about the future, which sometimes are right and sometimes are wrong. For instance: the great Victor Niederhoffer. Until the October stock plunge, the Randian iconoclast just couldn't miss a market turn. Then disaster struck. Between a wrong-way bet on the Thai baht and a wrong-way bet on the S&P 500, he lost $130 million of his clients' money, and $40 million of his own. On the other hand, he was down and out once before, so he cannot be counted out.

♦ **Harrods**, the famous London department store, was found guilty of racial discrimination for not hiring a black florist, and fined £16,500. The fact that she was "unclean" and had "untamed" hair and "unpolished speech" was no defense. (London *Times*, Nov. 4, 1997)

♦ **More friendly fire?** "An unidentified object narrowly missed a Swiss-Air Boeing 747" while the aircraft was at 23,000 feet near Philadelphia, reports Swiss Radio. The pilot described the object, which passed within 50 feet of the plane at very high speed, as "white, elongated, and without wings." He rejected as nonsense U.S. explanations that it was a weather balloon. This happened on August 9, but of course was suppressed by the media. (http://www.drudgereport.com) The FBI recently closed its investigation into the downing of TWA flight 800, even "persuading" the leading Internet advocate of the friendly-fire explanation to shut down his website and promise to shut up.

♦ **The failure of Fast Track gutted the president's authority** in international

Triple R (ISSN 1093-9237), formerly *The Rothbard-Rockwell Report*, is published monthly by the Center for Libertarian Studies, 875 Mahler Rd., Suite 150, Burlingame, CA 94010. (800) 325-7257. Vol. IX, No. 1. Postmasters: Send address changes to *Triple R*, P.O. Box 4091, Burlingame, CA 94011. *Editor*: Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr. *Contributing Editors*: David Gordon, Paul Gottfried, Hans-Hermann Hoppe, Michael Levin, Justin Raimondo, and Jeffrey Tucker. *Publisher*: Burton S. Blumert. Subscription: $49 for 12 issues. Single issue: $5. Copyright © 1998 by the Center for Libertarian Studies. All rights reserved. Unauthorized reproduction of this newsletter or its contents by xerography, facsimile, or any other means is illegal.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economics. But the line-item veto has vastly increased it on domestic affairs, just as independent voices (like the *Triple R*) long ago warned. Where the President used to call and beg individual members of Congress to vote this way or that way, now Congressmen call the president to beg his favor. The entire system created by the framers has been turned upside down. And, as the *Washington Post* notes, "one thing on which almost everyone interviewed could agree...was that the line-item veto would not serve as a significant break on federal spending, even for parochial 'pork-barrel' projects." (Oct. 24, 1997)

♦ **Social Democrats of the world** united in anger when the Hong Kong legislature repealed "labor rights." But look closely. What they repealed were mandates that companies allow collective bargaining. These were government interventions that were repealed, interventions that have brought Western economies to their knees in the past. The social democrats blame Hong Kong's lack of democracy under Chinese rule. Non-democracy does have it advantages. (CNN, Oct. 29, 1997)

♦ **Our December issue on "Conservative Meltdown"** had just gone to press when all our predictions came true. William Buckley fired *National Review* editor John O'Sullivan, and hired process-fixated 29-year-old D.C. writer Rich Lowry. Will Rich stop the slide in subscriptions, down a third? That depends on how many readers are interested in Congressional inside-baseball analysis. Meanwhile, the *American Spectator* became a madhouse weeks ahead of its 30th anniversary, with publisher Ronald Burr being fired and two lead writers (P.J. O'Rourke and Andrew Ferguson) resigning. Burr had committed the unpardonable sin of wanting to know what happened to a $600,000 grant from the Richard Mellon Scaife foundation. Then the board of National Empowerment Television kicked founder and CEO Paul Weyrich out the door. The cable operation, designed to bring policy wisdom from the Beltway to the benighted folks in the hinterland, has been a financial disaster, draining even Weyrich's Free Congress Foundation. Meanwhile just about everybody has distanced himself from the Love-the-Government Conservatism of Bill Kristol and David Brooks of *The Weekly Standard*. (London *Telegraph*, Oct. 21, 1997)

♦ **It was the highlight of the *American Spectator*'s 30th anniversary dinner** when Tucker Carlson of the *Weekly Standard* poured his bloody mary on the head of Grover Norquist of Americans for Tax Reform. The two had been very close in the past, but Carlson had attacked Norquist in the *New Republic*, and Norquist had responded with a stinging letter. Said an observer: "The celery stuck behind Grover's ear, making him look like a conservative Carmen Miranda." Then an aide to Norquist threw a glass of wine in Carlson's face. (*New York Post*, Nov. 14, 1997) Ah, Washington.

♦ **El Niño is the latest excuse** for a planned military takeover of the country. FEMA officials and other entrenched minions of the executive state met in Santa Monica, California, to plot how the economy should be planned in the wake of a natural disaster (don't you know the feds would love to bring one on). (CNN, Oct. 14, 1997)

♦ **Commie Clinton used a press conference in Argentina** to praise Cuban domestic policies. According to the *New York Times*, he said Cuba's health care and education systems "work better than most other countries"–an old canard from the far left. He said the Cubans might be reluctant to give up communism because they like these systems so much (not knowing they can keep them, as Clinton apparently believes they should). Strangely, in the White House transcript of the press conference, published on the web, this exchange was nowhere to be seen. (*New York Times*, Oct. 17, 1997)

♦ **Jeffrey Hart of Dartmouth College** is an old-time *National Review*-nik, which these days means you must love FDR. "With his silvery baritone on the radio, his jaunty, upturned cigarette holder and the background awareness that he had risen from polio, he remained strong amid the worst economic catastrophe the nation has ever known, a powerful embodiment of indomitability. It is true that clandestinely and unconstitutionally, he moved the nation toward war in 1940. Historically, that must be counted as great leadership." What? Is Jeff bucking for an appointment in the next administration? (King Features, Nov. 5, 1997)

♦ **With his unswerving devotion to free trade** and the Constitution, Ron Paul helped bring down fast track. "Constitutionally," he pointed out to his fellow Congressmen, "treaties must be passed by two-thirds of the senate. To say that these trade 'agreements' are not treaties is only so much fast talk." Fast track is "the process by which our nation was saddled with the harmful Nafta. I favor removing trade barriers, but free trade does not require massive Nafta-like documents which impose extensive government regulatory burdens upon citizens of signatory countries. Free trade agreements are far less complex, bilateral, and do not require formation of international bodies for their enforcement." RRR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NO MORE WARS from page 1

Why has Iraq put up with the invasions of its sovereignty at all? The short answer is that it wants to sell oil, buy food, and have a chance to rebuild after the devastation of the Gulf War. Yet the U.S. will not allow that, no matter what kinds of concessions Hussein makes.

Jude Wanniski, the irascible supply-side economist, has another theory: "In a world with at least 40 years of proven oil reserves," he writes, "it is in the interest of the oil producing countries and the oil companies who try to manage scarcity to keep Iraq and its oil bottled up."

No doubt economic motivations play a part. But there's a deeper explanation to U.S. belligerence. It goes to the heart of a fateful decision Washington's foreign policy elite made earlier in this decade: that no corner of the earth could be allowed to escape the ministrations of the U.S. empire. After all, we proclaimed ourselves, in messianic terms, "the world's indispensable nation."

How must that sound to others? William Drozdiak, writing for the *Washington Post* from Berlin, provides an understated account. "Across Europe, Asia, Latin America, and Africa," the "United States finds itself increasingly accused of bullying the rest of the world." And much of the criticism comes "from friendly nations that no longer feel prevented by Cold War loyalties from expressing their disagreements with Washington."

Disagree with Washington? That is a trend at home as well. It appears that, in this instance, the American people have more in common with the rest of the world than they do with their own government. RRR

DISINFORMATION AND THE WAR ON THE FAMILY

Michael Levin

Martial metaphors are best for describing the struggle over the family, since the family is an institution our cultural elite is out to destroy. This way of talking is not hype concocted by the right (always called "paranoid" in the press); the left itself instigated it. Remember the old SDS vow to "smash monogamy"? Well, the battle has been joined and on the propaganda front the left is well entrenched.

It was the communist theorist Gramsci who spoke, in the same militant tone, of a "long march through the institutions." One of the coveted spoils of victory was to be in control of the flow of information; with only a Marxist version of reality available, people would naturally accept the Marxist definition of "problems" and their solutions. And of course one of the most strategic positions to be taken was the university. Here the left has succeeded in planting its flag. Departments of psychology, sociology, anthropology, social work, and philosophy have in the last thirty years become what a friend of mine calls "Stalinist loonybins."

The left still hates marriage.

From these outposts now flows a torrent of negativity about marriage and the family. Everyone on any campus is vaguely aware that its resident intellectuals are hostile to "bourgeois" marriage, but conclusive documentation can be found in a new study entitled *Closed Hearts, Closed Minds*, published by the Institute for American Values.

No doubt armed with plenty of Dramamine, the author of the study, Norval Glenn, did what few would have the perseverance or stomach for: he read twenty of the twenty-two textbooks about marriage and the family that have appeared since 1994 (two publishers declined to send or sell him copies of their books). Glenn himself holds distinguished chairs in both sociology and American studies at the University of Texas, so he cannot be dismissed as an outsider poking his nose where it does not belong. Glenn is methodologically sophisticated and knows whereof he speaks.

Readers of *Triple R* will not be surprised that Glenn finds the monotone message of the newest texts to be the so-called "radical" feminism of the 1960s. As he summarizes this message, "marriage is just one of many equally acceptable and equally productive adult relationships. These various relationships include cohabiting couples, divorced non-couples, stepfamilies, and gay and lesbian families. In fact, if anything, marriage as a lifelong child-rearing bond holds special dangers, particularly for women, who, if they don't find marriage physically threatening, will very likely find it psychologically stifling."

Changing Families by one Judy Root Aulette, for instance, asserts that there are societies in which marriage is not found, and unapologetically offers Friedrich Engels as an authority on the subject: "According to Engels," Miss Aulette reports, "[the family] was created for a particular purpose: to control women and children." The only criticism she can muster of this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revered figure is that "his ideas have been criticized by radical, socialist and Marxist feminists." In truth, of course, marriage is a cultural universal, and Engels is about as intellectually reputable as Daffy Duck.

The theme of marriage as a form of sex discrimination is a constant. Most of the textbooks uncritically cite sociologist/feminist Jessie Bernard's 1971 *The Future of Marriage*, which purported to show that marriage is good for men but bad for women. (Even George Gilder was gulled by this spurious study in his *Men and Marriage*.) The basis for this claim is that slightly more divorced women than divorced men report being happy, but this is so, Glenn points out, because divorced men remarry more quickly than divorced women; divorced men interviewed by sociologists thus tend more to be recently divorced, and still in a state of shock, while the average divorced women has had longer to get used to her state. By any objective measure–health, happiness, longevity, emotional equilibrium, avoidance of risky behavior –married men and women are better off than their single counterparts.

Another deceptive claim repeated in these books is the alleged unsatisfactoriness of marital sex. One says unequivocally that "Divorced people [are] the most sexually active," and another asserts that cohabiting unmarrieds have sex as frequently as married couples. The first is true, he points out, only in the sense that, not surprisingly, divorced people have a greater number of sex partners; married people actually have sex more frequently, and report greater satisfaction. Likewise, married women are much more likely than cohabiting women (51% to 36%) to find sex emotionally satisfying.

These deceptions about sex are particularly fraught, I believe, because one of the most effective weapons of the liberationist left has been the charge that monogamy is for the "uptight," i.e. repressed, probably impotent fuddy-duddies jealous of the young 'uns having fun. This insinuated link between conservatism and sexual dysfunction is very hard to break, since normal people don't like to discuss their sex lives in public, and anyway loudly insisting "I am so normal" just makes people think you aren't. I myself am sure this canard played a large, underappreciated role in the amazingly quick sweep of the "sexual revolution." Glenn does a real service in beginning to expose it.

Monogamy is even more sensuous.

As for children, they are relatively invisible. And to the extent that they do appear, of course, a disproportionate emphasis is put on the harm families do them–on average, seven pages per book discuss child abuse, while only one-eighth of a page is given to the correlation between rearing in an intact family and avoidance of juvenile delinquency. Much of the rest of the good that intact, conventional families do children is cloaked by a statistical fallacy called "screening." Thus, one book argues that family structure is irrelevant to a child's well-being, since "what children need most is a warm, concerned relationship with at least one parent." This may be so, as Glenn notes, but such a relationship is much easier to sustain within an intact family than it is when divorced parents are at each other's throat or the parents were never married at all. Insofar as children are discussed at all, the main topic seems to be child abuse.

What these books do dwell on is the relation between husband and wife, with of course an antinomian spin. Only four out of twenty so much as mention the relation of family structure to juvenile delinquency, yet seven of them discuss "swinging" (i.e. wife-swapping) as a lifestyle. Six of the books neglect altogether to discuss the topic of stepfamilies–an important omission, given the space devoted to child abuse, since stepfathers are many times more likely to abuse their children than are biological fathers. Although Glenn does not attempt an explanation, one gets the impression that these textbooks are written with feminist blinders: the wife is assumed to be as career-oriented as the husband, so between the two of them any children are an afterthought.

At the same time that marriage and all its works are attacked, oddly enough, the rampancy of divorce is pooh-poohed. That half of all current marriages will end in divorce is persistently called a "myth"–the favorite leftist word for inconvenient facts–even though 39% of all marriages entered into in the 1970s have already ended. One book admits that divorce has risen a little, but attributes this to increases in lifespan: today's couples have longer to get sick of each other. In fact, Glenn notes, most divorces occur among young adults, and anyway the lifespan of Americans has not increased significantly since 1960, before the jump in divorce began.

Glenn does not explore this inconsistency–people supposedly hate their marriages yet continue to endure them–but I see it as a further effort to demoralize. If marriages are not being dissolved, after all, there is no reason to think that public policies–welfare, constant attacks on men in the workforce

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

–are weakening them, and therefore no reason to question these policies. While the barrage of anti-marriage propaganda weakens marriage, mendacity about the divorce rate leaves pro-family forces confused.

What are we to make of these incredible books? Common sense tells us, to adapt a favorite 60s slogan, that marriage must be good for children and other living things. It is the framework within which the human race produces the next generation; if human beings didn't like it, none of us would be here. And it must be equally gratifying for both sexes: saying that marriage is good for men but conflicts with the well-being of women makes as much sense as saying that meat is healthy for the male lion but bad for the lioness.

In other words, the authors of these books know they are lying. Here Glenn falls down a bit, for although duly critical of the books themselves, he is surprisingly benign about the motives of their authors and the instructors who use them in courses. He hears the ideological axes grinding, and deplores "political indoctrination," but he puts most of the blame on the market. Writing a textbook does not earn an academic points toward tenure, or much prestige. Publishers can get only journeymen instructors rather than leading scholars to review manuscripts because of the tiny stipends that attach to this onerous job. Glenn's solution is to urge promotion committees to reward textbook writing, and professional associations to impose quality control.

Those measures would be no better than letting the foxes into the chicken coop, or rather, since the foxes are already there, encouraging them to eat a higher grade of chicken. The problem isn't that the college instructors only get the books "the market" produces; that's just a roundabout way of saying college instructors are getting the books they want. The problem–the tragedy–is what they want. Things are not going to improve until a new, more sensible generation of academics replaces the one in there now. RRR

RANKING PRESIDENTS

Paul Gottfried

In the September 29 *Weekly Standard,* James Pierson, executive director of the John M. Olin Foundation, compared two recent surveys ranking American presidents. One survey, organized by Arthur Schlesinger and involving 32 scholars, virtually all liberal, was published in the *New York Times Magazine.* The other, conducted by the Intercollegiate Studies Institute, surveyed 32 conservative and neoconservative scholars, mostly historians.

Do conservative historians really love Lincoln and FDR?

The ISI panelists were subsequently informed by mail and in the *Weekly Standard* of the opinions expressed. As a participant, I read these results with some interest and much amazement: 29 of the 38 panelists apparently rated Lincoln, together with Washington, at the top of the list.

Pierson found it "encouraging to see that despite all the historical revisionism that has taken place since the 1960s, both of these great men have emerged with their reputations intact." Pierson is further gratified that the ISI panelists "acknowledge [Franklin D. Roosevelt's] lasting influence and historical importance" and rate him almost as high as Lincoln. Though Pierson is bothered by the negative opinion of the neocon Clinton, who "has confirmed and consolidated Ronald Reagan's contributions while moving his own party toward the center," he is generally satisfied with the ISI survey that he must have funded.

But as one of the forgotten panelists, who gave Lincoln, Wilson, and FDR all low grades, allow me to express skepticism about the reported results. It is inconceivable that the ISI panel, which includes Marshall L. DeRosa, George W. Carey, Forrest McDonald, and other published critics of Lincoln, would have honestly produced only two dissents on the greatness of Lincoln, or given overwhelming support to the similar greatness of FDR.

Though the panel has too many neocon Straussians to reflect true conservative scholarly opinion, both the paleos and the libertarians (e.g., Leonard Liggio and Burton Folsom) would have influenced the survey results more significantly than was suggested by the Pierson-ISI report. The non-neocon panelists, of whom I count 8 to 10, would not have voted to put non-activist presidents near the bottom of the list, while shoving most of the liberal activists (save for Woodrow Wilson) toward the top.

As the organizer of the Conservative Historians Caucus and a co-founder of the conservative historical

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

periodical *Continuity*, I know personally most of the historians featured as panelists, and doubt that their unpressured votes would have resulted in the findings reported.

It is also difficult to believe that intellectuals who had been self-identified conservatives before the neocons grabbed their movement have always thought like Cold War liberals. Until the mid-seventies, the relevant views on the presidency were those of Frank Meyer, Wilmoore Kendall, M.E. Bradford, and George Carey. In this view, imperial presidents –particularly Lincoln, Wilson, and FDR–were responsible for the centralization that had overridden regional and communal liberties, and subverted constitutional republican government.

Of course, some of these guys are on the neocon payroll.

What impelled respondents who had been conservatives when conservatism meant opposition to an overbearing executive state as personified by Lincoln and FDR, to take a radically different position? Of those who had been conservatives twenty or thirty years ago, one might also ask if they had only pretended to hold opinions which were less progressive than those they now profess.

Another possibility is that the findings offered by Pierson were either invented or manipulated. ISI is financially dependent for its survival, and certainly owes its growth in recent years, to heavy funding from the neocon foundations, particularly Olin and Bradley. Pierson himself is a demonstrated vassal of the Kristol family. He has used Olin money not only to reward neocon lackeys but to mobilize them against paleos, something he did brilliantly in derailing my own academic career. He might even have left in the negative judgments about the neocon Clinton for authenticity.

Equally possible is that respondents to the ISI survey felt compelled to provide certain answers. They may have been told who else was being surveyed, that the results would be widely known, and that they themselves might be individually identified.

Inasmuch as I don't care about who knows my political opinions, or whom they might offend, I felt no restraint about being candid. Possibly other respondents felt differently, especially if they were led to believe that uncongenial judgments might land in the hands of neocon foundation directors who could decide their financial future.

Say that Hillel Fradkin of Bradley or Pierson of Olin learned that a particular respondent, who was also applying for funding, held incorrect views about Lincoln, FDR, or Truman (someone else who received relatively high scores on the ISI survey).

One could easily imagine what would happen to the funding and professional prospects of this respondent. He might even find it hard to extract further guest lecture honoraria from ISI, Hillsdale College, and other fixtures of neocondom.

One does not have to assume that the panelists were told that Pierson and his friends would get hold of their answers. All that one has to assume is that some respondents thought this might happen, given ISI's links to the neocon financial empire. And this assumption would have been correct, in view of what did happen. It's also highly probable that the idea for this survey came from neocon powerbrokers trying to underscore their links to "conservative scholars." A few wild cards, like me and DeRosa, were left in the deck, but steps could be taken to make sure the results would confirm the *Weekly Standard*-Jim Pierson view of American history.

Most significantly, many of the scholars featured in Pierson's story, starting with Harvey Mansfield, have been repeated recipients of neocon money. In some cases the scholars cited as admirers of the Lincoln-FDR legacy have received millions of dollars in neocon grants, mostly from Olin.

Those who provided Pierson with suitable quotations turned up in my own detailed research on the neocon foundations as among the most heavily endowed individual recipients of neocon payola.

All this illustrates what Murray Rothbard used to say about determining the motives of historical actors: "while greed and material interest may not be everything, any other explanation about why people do things must come in a far second." RRR

BEYOND ALL REASON

Phyllis Spivey

While doing research for an article on California's draconian new smog check program, I collided with essays written by Lynn Scarlett for *Reason*, "America's magazine of 'free minds and free markets.'" Ms. Scarlett is executive director of the Reason Public Policy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Institute and oversees its research. She is also vice president of research at the Reason Foundation.

Given her titles, one might expect Scarlett to approach freedom-robbing eco-mandates with hostility. Even *National Review* and Rush Limbaugh recognize global environmentalism as the new home of socialism. But in her May 1996 article, "Evolutionary Ecology," Scarlett repeatedly betrays her bias with such absurd statements as "Environmental policy is finally growing up," and by urging reforms she labels free market, but

Libertarians loving big government.

which actually move toward expanding eco-bureaucracies. When her obvious acceptance of the movement's goals provoke her to such declarations as "institutions must evolve to deal with these hard [scientifically unsupportable] cases," you know you have met a statist whose blood runs green.

Yet, with all Ms. Scarlett's philosophical meanderings, she is just so *Reason*. For over the years, and in the name of liberty, the folks at *Reason* magazine have likewise worked to forge a new vision–a kind of sixties-style libertarianism they describe as a combination of classical liberalism and "a forward looking, dynamic vision of America's third century." Unfortunately, their ideal America would incorporate policies destructive to the very institutions and principles necessary to preserving freedom.

Flood the country with school vouchers, public-private partnerships, and ever-escalating taxes misidentified as user fees and congestion pricing. Have the central government force states to kill the death penalty, legalize drugs, accord special rights to gays, and recognize their abominable marriages. Endorse racial victimology, find new areas to litigate (as in date-rape), ensure unlimited Third World immigration and, through it all, invoke the cause of liberty.

One can't help wonder if, or how much, foundation and corporate contributors to the Reason Foundation influence policy, especially when the list includes such devotees to big government as Xerox, Goldman Sachs, and ARCO. Suspicion takes over when you draw an imaginary line from the foundation's half dozen major oil company donors to Ms. Scarlett and her 1994 gubernatorial appointment to chair California's Interim Inspection & Maintenance Review Committee.

The committee, now permanent, makes recommendations to revise the state's vehicle smog check program. So-called stationary polluters, e.g., oil companies, want Smog Check II implemented to take some of the heat off, and have gone to bed with the eco-tyrants, green politicians, and bureaucrats to get it. But California drivers and taxpayers just won't lie down.

In her December 1996 article, "Smogged Down," Ms. Scarlett presses for Smog Check II. Portraying angry taxpayers as misinformed crybabies, she contends that some of the brouhaha results from "the inevitable resentment of any program–however wisely planned and implemented –that would hit people directly in their own pocketbooks." As if the state weren't already robbing Californians at every turn, Ms. Scarlett advises readers, "There just ain't no free lunch."

Denying charges that the state was seizing people's vehicles, Scarlett assures, "the program is no mere 'boondoggle' or further testament to government excess." But the same month her article appeared in *Reason*, the *Libertarian Party of California NEWS* published a boast from the state's smog check czar–"we're going to get your cars"–and quoted federal EPA administrator Will Yellowtail: "We need to get Americans out of their cars (into public transit)."

If Ms. Scarlett really doubts that the environmental cabal intends to separate Americans from their cars, she ought to read Al Gore's best-selling *Earth in the Balance* or review the plethora of EPA, HUD, and Interior Department policies that at best would make automobiles too expensive for most people to own or at worst would eliminate them altogether. All else failing, she might try Michael Fumento's article, "Polluted Science" in the August/September issue of *Reason*. A world away from her sympathetic views of government and environmentalism, the Fumento analysis, like Scarlett herself, is just one more manifestation of the continuing paradox that is *Reason*. RRR

A MANIFESTO FOR OUR TIMES

L.H.R., Jr.

Whatever happened to the old-fashioned political manifesto? For one thing, nobody wants to read that claptrap anymore. Who cares what the newest New Democrat has to say about ways to improve government programs? As

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for neocons, their thought is so confused and internally contradictory, it inspires no desire for real-world political action.

A real manifesto must make the reader supremely angry, and provide him a rationale for transforming the world on grounds of justice and right. It can't be funded by a large foundation. It must spring from the heart and be based on a rock-solid intellectual foundation. Like Marx's. Like Rothbard's.

Now, seemingly out of nowhere, comes a remarkable treatise and a cultural landmark: *The Redneck Manifesto* by Jim Goad, a writer in Portland, Oregon. This is not a joke. Far from it. It is a supremely bitter, hugely well informed, passionate call for action on the part of lower-class white people to rise up against government and its elites and reestablish a regime where rednecks (a word used the way blacks call themselves "niggers") are no longer taxed, looted by inflation, sent off to foreign wars, governed by crooked elites in New York and Washington, and generally oppressed by the cultural elite.

How many questions is this guy sound on? Just about all of them. Here's a sample of his analysis of the disparity between media commentary on whites and blacks:

"In their putsch to redress past grievances, the trash-bashers will expound endlessly about white-trash primitivism while ignoring some unpleasant realities about modern-day Africa. Dumb manifestations of American blackness are explained away as 'culture' while white trash's peccadilloes are blamed on stupidity. If a black doctor seems embarrassed by scrotum-clutching gangsta rappers and sweaty black preachers, he's branded a race traitor and a sellout. But if a white lawyer seems ashamed of ball-scratching hillbillies and sweaty white preachers, it's a perfectly understandable distaste. If a white guy handles poisonous snakes to prove his faith in Jesus, he's a dope. But if a black guy sacrifices live chickens to appease voodoo gods, it's respected as a valid cultural expression. It's OK to mention Caucasian in breeding, but not African-American teen-pregnancy rates. You can rage on trailer trash, but not ghetto scum.

"Dumb manifestations of blackness are explained away as 'culture' while white trash's peccadilloes are blamed on stupidity."

You can make fun of truck drivers, but not lowriders. Third World infomercial Stop the Hunger poster babies live in poverty because they were somehow forced into it, while rednecks have no one but themselves to blame."

You get the idea. He's sound on a whole range of cultural issues.

"Elvis is frequently blamed for single-handedly stealing rock 'n' roll from black people.... If Elvis was trying to sound black, he didn't do a very good job. I hear more jittery hillbilly-/western swing–WHITE influences–in his music than I hear black jazz or blues. The thumbprint of black music seems much deeper on the Beatles and Rolling Stones, but those limey ratfinks don't get blamed nearly as often as Elvis. Why? I'll venture that the Beatles and Stones get off easy not because they're more authentically 'black' than Elvis, but because they're less actually hillbilly than he was. Elvis-bashing doesn't show sensitivity for blacks; it shows hatred of hillbillies."

He's sound on civil liberties: "The militia-chasers know how to play the race card. AGAIN and AGAIN and AGAIN. I'll bet you didn't know that anyone who criticizes bankers is a closet anti-Semite with schizophrenic delusions. And that anyone who questions the federal government's claims to historical innocence is actually hiding his sexual inadequacy and hatred for blacks."

If you like conspiracy theories–and what sharp observer of the present scene does not?–here's your eloquent defender:

"Paranoia? There was nothing shady about the fact that George Bush became president after being a former CIA director?... There was nothing strange about the assassinations of JFK and MLK? Watergate? Whitewater? The Rosenbergs? The McCarthy hearings? The Pentagon Papers? The Bay of Pigs? Kent State? Iran-contra? Wall Street junk-bond trading? Absolutely NONE of this sounds fishy to you? Maybe we wouldn't be so [friggin'] PARANOID if they hadn't [friggin'] LIED to us so many times. Just a thought. Put on the blindfold and pop in the earplugs. Otherwise, they'll think you're paranoid."

Goad defends militias, stockpiling of weapons, and tax protests, and attacks the Federal Reserve (based on a book by Ron Paul!), foreign wars, democracy, and the federal government in general. He even sees the institution of government itself as a rip-off. The language is rough (too rough), there's an unfortunate anti-boss element to his populism, he's not kind to religion, and he has a few disgusting asides.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But it remains an incredibly solid peek into white rage at the present state of the country. It's beautifully written, well footnoted, and in places even scholarly. It's a wonder it was published at all, much less by Simon & Schuster. This book might, and should, become a cult classic. *The Redneck Manifesto* deserves a close read. RRR

FREE FALL

L.H.R., Jr.

Government insiders are terrified, the establishment is panicked, and the looter classes are seeing their lives pass before their eyes. They are all suddenly stricken with this feeling–indeed they are beginning to know for sure–that government as they've known it is no longer viable or sustainable. Indeed, its status and power are in a free fall.

What's more, the collapse isn't occurring because of some pre-orchestrated, party-driven "soft landing" for the welfare-warfare state. It is being driven by a fierce force of public sentiment that despises government and all its works. A critical block of taxpayers has lost all sense of loyalty to the American national project and is no longer going to be tricked by partisan shell games.

Our times–radically different from the Cold War that dominated the last half of this century–are defined by burrowing into private life, with families and cultural enclaves seeking to escape the machinations of government as much as we are able. The costs for government and its central plan have been enormous. Our social managers have lost the ability to keep the people's attention and to inspire their obedience.

Suddenly, essential dogmas of establishment rule are taking long and steep tumbles. What are these dogmas? The president is "leader of the free world." He is "commander in chief." The weight of the world is on his shoulders, so he must always garner the utmost respect. The broad outline of his "policy agenda"–always approved in advance by the power elites–must always pass Congress. He has the power to get his way if he really wants to.

D.C., and all connected to it, are headed down.

All of this mythology is in tatters, as present history is taking a wild and unpredictable course, with nearly all public events pointing to the rapid disintegration of the Cold War governing consensus. It's gotten so bad for the elites that they must surely be terrified to pick up the morning papers. The fear is not so much the continuing rebellion against Washington, which has gone on for years now. What scares the Hell out of them is the growing realization that there is little or even nothing they can do to stop it or change its course.

The elites are losing control, and this fact is becoming widely known, not only in this country but around the world. The disintegration of federal power has, for the first time, begun to feed on itself. The less power Washington is perceived to have, the less power it has in fact. The less power it has in fact, the less able it is to gain more or even keep what power it has. The fiction of government–fiction because its power is ultimately dependent on the sheer will of people to obey–is being revealed.

Let us consider some recent events, which would have been unimaginable only ten years ago. Each highlights the quiet but deeply radical times we are living through.

Fast Track. Its defeat just takes your breath away. Since the New Deal and before, the president has been seen as the living embodiment of America: its consumers, businesses, households, exporters, and interests. His words were words of power, and when he promised the head of some foreign "nation" something, he could deliver it.

This power is essential to the very idea of treaties, negotiations, diplomacy, and international government-to-government deal making. Fast Track gives him swagger and allows him to bully other nations, threatening to

Dean of the Austrian School of economics, American historian, founder of modern libertarianism, and restorer of the Old Right, Murray N. Rothbard (1926–1995) was a one-man army of liberty. The *Triple R* is inspired by his spirit, and dedicated to his vision.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make or break their economies. It allows him to pass out favors to friendly businesses while punishing unfriendly ones.

Without it, the president is just another lawmaker with a large public profile. He is an interesting dinner guest, but can promise nothing. In matters of trade, he has no carrots and no sticks. All authority ends up back where the Constitution put it in the first place: with Congress.

All the good guys fought long and hard against Nafta and Gatt (which created the World Trade Organization), but in the end we lost. It was a terrible disappointment, but something we are used to. We all believe that we were put on this earth in part to fight. Fighting evil is its own reward even when we lose the battle. Besides, we are used to evil winning.

Evil won these battles the old-fashioned way: payoffs and intimidation. The votes that were on the margin were given the usual package of special privileges, and billions of tax dollars were thrown to anybody on the sidelines. Those who were against Nafta and Gatt were called stupid "isolationists" who were not interested in participating in the modern world.

Yet it turns out that our struggles eventually paid very high returns. We knocked the intellectual props out from under the trade-treaty scam–arguing that Nafta was managed trade not free trade–and demoralized the advocates of these treaties by sustaining a massive and wide-ranging organized resistance.

At last, Congress, bowing to massive public opposition and noticing virtually no support outside the establishment, rebuffed by its leadership and the White House by refusing to grant Clinton fast-track authority. The president has been grounded, his wings clipped to tiny stubs. It causes his power to evaporate in international trading relations.

If we were shocked, the establishment is even more so, realizing that it has been dealt a deadly blow. It had thrown everything into this battle, but in the end, the money, vote trading, editorial backing, and establishment intimidation didn't work. Fast Track is dead.

All along, the establishment, including the Beltway think tanks, tried to wrap up the cause of free trade with Fast Track. But it's not true. Free trade means not impeding the ability to import and export, a doctrine any educated believer in freedom must support. Fast Track, in contrast, means executive dictatorship fashioned on the Cold War model. Indeed, Fast Track means the opposite of free trade in many instances.

Want free trade? Then end the Iraq embargo.

Consider this irony. The very week that Clinton was pushing for Fast Track authority–and the Republican leadership was promising to deliver the votes, guaranteed–the White House was rattling the sabers against Saddam Hussein. Yet what is that conflict really about? Not nuclear inspectors and U2 spy planes. It's about the U.S. attempt to starve out Iraq, not only by refusing to allow American companies to buy oil from Iraq, but by browbeating the entire world into refusing even necessities like food, penicillin, and medical equipment into the country.

And this administration wants us to believe it wants free trade? Why not start by calling an end to the attempt to destroy an entire people by starving them to death? Economic sanctions of this sort are war by another means. It is made possible only by the belief that the president should be a dictator in foreign affairs. They say refusing Fast Track diminishes his stature and makes it difficult for him to run the world. Darn right. That's a step towards freedom.

The morning after the vote, a hysterical commentator on National Government Radio yelped that the defeat of Fast Track was the most devastating blow to government power since the collapse of the League of Nations. That shows how important this vote was to the power elites. If true, that would make the defeat of Fast Track the second most magnificent political development of our century (the tanking of that Wilsonian monstrosity of world government being the first).

If you haven't already done so, break open the champagne!

Bipartisan Meltdown. Clinton has suffered a massive blow, and commentators are now openly speaking of him as a lame duck–with more than two years left in his second term! All the more time for him to enjoy the perks that come with office, that is, if he can avoid a conviction on grounds of sexual harassment from the courts. Meanwhile, he becomes a president without substantial political power and without a party to back him.

Give some credit to the Congressional Democrats. For some time, these pages have urged radical *Triple R*-style paleolibertarians not to give up hope on this party. Whatever is wrong with the Democrats, they are not as enthralled with the neoconservative agenda of global domination, world government, nationalization of schools, and boundless immigration. Thus the Democrats voted against Fast Track.

For the wrong reasons? Perhaps, but who cares? For years, I've heard

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that when Republicans support bad policy (vouchers, welfare reshuffling, tax rejiggering, and social security "privatization"), they are at least doing it for the right reasons. All that means is that they use libertarian rhetoric to cover up government crimes. If someone wants to use leftist rhetoric to gut the power of the presidency, that's perfectly fine.

On the other hand, give no credit to the Republican leadership, which is made up of a bunch of power-hungry, drunken, corrupt, womanizing sellouts who excel only in their constant desire to suck up to the worst of American statism. Thus they were the key movers and shakers behind Fast Track. Now they too have suffered a defeat. The entire Lott of them ought to be deposed without DeLay.

In truth, both parties have long been integral parts of a conspiracy of the power elites against the public. There are good and even great individuals in them (Ron Paul of Texas, for instance) but their leadership is rotten to its very core. As the executive state declines in its power and status in American public life, so should the political parties. And they will. Watch voter turn out in 1998. *Triple R* predicts the lowest in the history of the country. If more than 80 percent of eligible voters sit this election out, there will be no mandate for big government.

Protest for Prayer. Since the civil-rights movement, students across the country, and especially in the South, have been taught that blacks protested to gain their essential rights. They did so against a government that refused to grant them their rights. They undertook enormous personal sacrifices, endured beatings, fire hoses, jail, and public humiliation to stand up for an eternal principle: that no group should be forced to suffer unjust and unequal treatment by the law.

It's a bunch of baloney, of course. The civil-rights movement was orchestrated by Washington elites who sought an end to states rights, property rights, and freedom of association. They also wanted the humiliation of whites. As has been well documented, it was led by communists in league with statists of all sorts. Far from giving people rights, the result was to take away rights from people who merely sought to govern themselves and use their own property any way they saw fit.

Pray, and the elites tremble.

Nonetheless, the official myths of the civil-rights movement have stuck, while the truth can be found only in library books and publications like this one. As a result, anytime a group feels itself under undue legal pressure, subject to discrimination at the hands of government, it uses the mythical example of the civil-rights movement to get its way.

That's a terrible thing when we're talking, say, about gay rights, but there is a magnificent upside. Christians who actually do suffer terrible humiliations at the hands of the law are into the act. The subject this time isn't abortion, but prayer, specifically the right to pray in school.

In Alabama, it is still common for schools to open the day with prayer, and for that prayer sometimes to be explicitly Christian (if non-denominational). At sports events, it is even more common. People accept this way as a matter of course, and few understand that it is a violation of federal law. However, Ira DeMent, a typically arrogant and usurping federal judge, flouting the wishes of Alabama Governor Fob James, recently handed down a very detailed ruling striking down a whole class of prayers in school.

In a Boaz, Alabama, high school, and a slew of other towns, the students knew what to do. In defiance of their teachers and principals, they left class en mass and went to the front steps of the school to kneel and say the Lord's Prayer. In one case, hundreds of students were put on suspension. In another case, the opening of a football game was delayed when players, cheerleaders, and students went out into the middle of the field to pray some more.

This event, still continuing at this writing, so terrified the establishment that it ended up on the front page of the *New York Times*. But unlike during the civil-rights days, when all opponents of the federal empire were dismissed as racists, there was precious little way to attack these students. They merely want the freedom to see the faith of nearly everyone somehow embodied in the public ceremony of the schools they run and pay for. (In Alabama, local property taxes pay for most of the public school's budget.)

These days, it is very difficult to argue that religion in schools would be a terrible thing, since even the left admits that the public-school system is barren of values. Certainly, public opinion is 100 percent behind the protestors. The *New York Times* complained that these students were resisting federal decrees in the same way their ancestors did in the 1960s, and that prayer is merely the newest proxy for race in Alabama's ongoing battle for reactionary goals. A tough case to make.

The bad guys are genuinely trapped this time. No matter how you slice it, it makes no sense to deny people the right to organized prayer in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their own local schools. To do so is an egregious violation of religious liberty. It's unconstitutional, it's unsound educationally, and it's an affront to Christians, who have had just about all that they can take.

Everyone knows there is a religious revival afoot in the land, and it would be silly to think that it is not going to affect the place of religion in American public life. At some point, people are going to demand that what they know to be true in their hearts be legally expressed in public and in their own institutions.

The *New York Times* is so alarmed by these developments that it is warning about other trouble spots on the horizon. In South Carolina, for example, a Christian educational movement is gaining steam centered on a single goal: withdrawing kids from the public schools, and putting them into inexpensive Christian academies or home schools.

It's about time! Not all public schools are terrible; in areas where the population is relatively homogenous and local property tax revenue stays in local public schools, they can even work quite well–not as well as before the first world war, but satisfactorily nonetheless. But increasingly, it is not only demographics that are dictated from above, but also curriculum.

Why have parents sat by and allowed their students to be taught values inimical to their own? Why have they allowed their authority to be undermined by the state and federal government, which seeks to indoctrinate their children in secularist theories and libertine sexuality? The short answer is that the public schools do not charge tuition. That sets the threshold of tolerance much higher than it otherwise would be. But it appears we are nearing the day when people will say the loss of the children is not worth the money saved.

Not coincidentally, Clinton has struck back with a new federal plan for Stalinist indoctrination of every school child in the country, K-12. He plans anti-hate campaigns in every classroom in the country, and decries the fact that parents are still teaching their children to hate. (Oh sure.) But an effort like this can only speed up the day when we see a mass exodus from public schools.

Neither does such an exodus have to happen all at once. Right now, there are enough smart kids in public school to provide peers for other smart children. But as people who live in inner cities know, when the good people begin to leave, the quality of a school can spin down the drain very quickly.

While Alabama kids prayed, the Christian Coalition was AWOL.

A note on the Christian right: while these great students in Alabama were resisting the leviathan state and demanding their religious rights in the best way they knew how, what were organizations like the Family Research Council and the Christian Coalition doing? Certainly not backing the students. That would be too radical. Instead, they were protesting the visit of the Chinese president because he doesn't allow sufficient religious freedom in his country. (Although the improvement since Mao is astronomical.)

For example, groups in China that want to practice their faith have to get approval from the government first. Gee, I wonder where else this practice is common? While the Christian right was screaming for trade war against China, supposedly on behalf of poor suffering Christians, Christian students in their own backyard were being suspended from school for protesting a federal judge's limitations of their religious freedom.

Sales Tax. A constant irritant to the feds–and to many state officials–is that they aren't able to tax goods when they are sold at retail across state lines. The states only enforce the sales tax in their own state. The result has been a huge and long-lasting boom in mail-order goods. Of late this has meant a huge boom in Internet commercial traffic where people can buy at the best price wherever it is offered.

States estimate, with the help of federal tax officials, that they lose up to $215 billion in tax revenue per year because of out-of-state orders. So for the last several years, under federal guidance, states have conspired to end this loophole, made possible only by new software that allows businesses to calculate tax liability in a wide range of tax environments. Thus if a person in Texas buys wine in California, he would also pay sales tax to the California government; if the Californian buys beef from Texas, the state would benefit.

States–particularly Texas and Wisconsin–have been leaning on companies whose main source of income is mail order. We all know the names: Lands' End, L.L. Bean, American Express's products divisions, and Gateway 2000 computers, to name a few. They were pressured by the feds, the Direct Marketing Association, and state governments to enter into a tax pact.

The announcement was ever so subtle. The *New York Times* said a deal to close the mail-order loophole was imminent, and named Lands' End

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and L.L. Bean as co-conspirators in the plot. While this deal would bring in at least $1.2 billion in revenue in the first year, consumers wouldn't mind much at all.

"Negotiators for the mail-order industry see little downside in the tax-collection plan," the paper said nonchalantly. Indeed, one survey said people buy through the mail for convenience, selection, and quality. Avoiding sales tax is way down the list.

Famous last words. Within hours of the report, angry calls jammed the 800 lines of mail-order houses all across the country, demanding they not charge tax. Lands' End in particular was blasted by the tens of thousands of people who denounced the pact. Then the Direct Market Association backed away from the plan, repudiated it, and promised not to tax sales.

The tax revolt lives! No new taxes, ever! The masses struck down a tax plan within hours of its being proposed and endorsed by the entire government-media-business establishment. If this level of resistance had been alive in years past, there would have been very little chance that taxes proposed by Bush, Reagan, Carter, Nixon—and all the way back—would have passed at all. The end of the Cold War has changed this too, heightening the tax revolt to a permanent condition of American political life.

This event was highly significant because of the commercial prospects of the Internet. It has only recently dawned on tax officials that this medium represents the infrastructure of retailing in the next century. With bills very likely to pass Congress that make taxing business on the Internet illegal, that means a massive retail sector will develop in an entirely tax-free environment.

This fact has not been lost on the feds, who fear that the Internet will also offer possibilities for hiding, saving, and spending substantial amounts of income. This explains part of the sudden interest in Washington in the national sales tax. If a retail tax were nationalized, it would obviously have to apply to the Internet as well, which would put a serious damper on its development as a tool for business.

But this fact is not very well known. Even some libertarians have been tricked into thinking a national sales tax would be a great thing. But when these same people figure out that it would be devastating to Internet traffic, and the public backlash occurs, they will run from it as quickly as the Direct Marketing Association ran from its tax plot.

A new model of corporate defiance is emerging.

Business Regulation. For many years, business has taken its lumps from government and put up with every bit of it. The model here is Texaco, which only last year suffered a horrible beating from the EEOC, and quickly bowed to the government's wishes at every point.

But a new model of corporate defiance is emerging. It was pioneered by the Hooter's restaurant chain, a tacky outfit but which nonetheless doesn't deserve to have the government tack sex quotas on its hiring policies. Hooter's eventually settled a suit brought by the EEOC, but the owners stirred up loads of trouble in the meantime. They went on the offensive with a public relations campaign showing hairy guys in short skirts and tight t-shirts —something only the government could think is marketable.

Far more impressive has been the Microsoft response to the Justice Department's claim that it is illegally bundling its Windows software with its web browser. Time was when such a company would hunker down and hope for the best. Microsoft, instead, has come out swinging, writing its own brief against the Justice Department, distributing op-eds denouncing the government's attempt to regulate the software industry, and decrying Janet Reno as the enemy of free enterprise that she is.

But will it have an effect? Probably not in the past. But the anti-trust police have made a huge mistake. They are trying to regulate an industry that millions of people know far more about than any Justice Department economist. Average people are experts in the minutia of software marketing, and they know from their own experience that the government's ruling is absurd.

Especially in times when government fears the people—even more, it sometimes seems, than the people fear government—public pressure can be extremely effective in beating back such interventions. If Microsoft succeeds—or even if it is not excessively punished for its intransigence—we could see ever more corporate resistance of Washington's machinations. At last, business, backed by the masses of consumers who understand the benefits of free enterprise, has begun to fight back.

Don't Come Back! Al Hunt in the *Wall Street Journal* is mad over Congress's long recess. It left in early November, and won't be back until February. This is irresponsible, he said, because we need a much bigger government. Why, there hasn't been such a long vacation since 1965, the "most productive" legislative session

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

since the New Deal, according to Hunt. Most productive for the state, of course.

When I was a kid, everyone I knew followed Congress closely. Now almost no one pays any attention, for the central state is less and less relevant. Take longer vacations, Congress, and take the rest of the government with you.

Retreat to Private Life. The same conservatives who condemned people's sadness over the death of Princess Diana also denounced the public's wild fascination with the trial of *au pair* Louise Woodward in the death of the infant under her care. Why did people care so much? Vouyerism? Fascination with death? These theories were bandied about.

Yet the real reason is very different. The idea of working moms with infant children is barely 15, or at most, 20 years old. The standardization of the practice is contrary to what mothers know is best. Yet the cultural elites have browbeat women into believing they should never "interrupt" their career to raise kids, even when they can afford to do so.

The mother of the child was shocked and horrified that she received letters from around the country denouncing her for being off at work while a 19-year-old foreign hireling cared for her 8-month-old baby. But that's precisely the point: in a remarkable cultural landmark, mothers all over the country have been warned of the possible consequences of defying tradition and natural law. (Many mothers don't have a choice. This rich mother did.)

In short, it was a profoundly conservative impulse that brought about the intense public interest in the Louise Woodward case. Just as the Diana frenzy was driven by an old-fashioned interest in royalty, the tragic consequences of marital infidelity, the continuing centrality of beauty in the womanly aesthetic, and the wages of sin, this case was animated by the realization that all mothers who can should and must make a choice between the security of their families and their own financial and social status. This is a message that is profoundly reactionary, the worst possible nightmare of the feminist establishment.

The central priority for any true lover of liberty is that the U.S. stay out of war.

We are entering a time when private life is held at a premium and government is looked down on and despised by nearly everyone not directly on the payroll. It is a necessary pre-condition to the complete depoliticization of society. It doesn't mean that people don't care about public events (indeed Diana's death and the Woodward trial were hugely public); rather, the concerns people have are not related to vagueries like the "national interest" but only issues that connect with people directly and speak to enduring themes of family, love, and faith.

The growth of private life—which the left had tried to abolish—is the ideal condition that freedom needs to emerge from a century of statism and crushing central government power. What could derail us? The short answer is war. It is no wonder that Clinton has turned to foreign policy to distract from his domestic troubles. Now, more than ever, the central priority for any true lover of liberty is that the U.S. stay out of war, so that the central government, the thief of our liberty and property, will continue its free fall, and at last hit bottom. RRR

THE RIGHT PRIZE FOR PEACE

L.H.R., Jr.

Snickering at the Nobel Peace Prize is a conservative tick left over from Cold War days. So this year, conservatives have derided winner Jody Williams, coordinator of the anti-landmine campaign, as a "leftist" comparable to "apologists for terror" (the words of a *Wall Street Journal* writer) who have also won the prize.

The right has even come to the defense of the little metal monsters strewn throughout the world, maiming some 26,000 innocent civilians every year. Just so we're clear: according to conservative theory, the welfare state represents out-of-control government, but the warfare state must never be limited or even questioned in its power to kill foreign peoples at taxpayer expense.

In truth, the campaign to ban landmines fits squarely within the Just War tradition of St. Augustine, and was once accepted as part of the conservative canon. Originating in the 4th century, Just War theory was developed by Catholic Thomists in the Middle Ages and early Renaissance, then propagated to England and America through Grotius, Pufendorf, and other Protestant natural-law theorists.

The central propositions derive from moral theology: war is an act of killing and therefore must be morally justified. And it can only be justified under severe restrictions. Here are the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

three main ones: war must be defensive; the means used must be proportional to the threat; and civilians must not be touched.

The U.S. government's refusal to sign the treaty betrays its rejection of the Just War tradition. For example, the contraptions stay alive long after an armistice. This year, a little girl was killed in Egypt by a landmine planted in 1942. So much for the proportionality principle.

Up to 100 million landmines are buried in 68 nations. The worst problems are in Angola, Afghanistan, Cambodia, Vietnam, Laos, and Mozambique, where landmines kill farmers and their families every day. Most mines in Southeast Asia were planted by the U.S. military.

Where's the defense in that? In fact, U.S. objections to the treaty have nothing to do with security here at home. The U.S. wants landmines so it can exercise imperial control over distant countries we have no business patrolling in the first place.

The most unjust aspect of landmines involves the victims: civilians out for a stroll. Not that the blood of a few thousand kids should trouble the government that still justifies its incineration of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, but the U.S. is still morally responsible for every lost limb.

Jody Williams explains her goal: "while war may not go away in our lifetime, there are rules about how you conduct yourself in war. If the military think they have to fight with each other, they should point the guns at each other; they should not involve all of civil society."

Exactly. Williams may be of a different ideological pedigree, but she could teach conservatives a thing or two about limiting government. Indeed, the planting of landmines is a war crime by any civilized standard. The famous picture of Diana holding a small, one-legged child–viciously parodied on the cover of *National Review*–illustrates the damage landmines do.

The treaty the U.S. should sign prohibits the use, production, and deployment of anti-people landmines. It requires that stockpiles be demolished. Most importantly, those already planted must be collected by the responsible parties, and then destroyed. So long as the State Department wants U.S. troops wandering the globe, picking up these little death traps is a fine use of their time.

The Pentagon argues that it needs these weapons to make its foreign wars more winnable. Does that mean if it can't use landmines, the U.S. is less likely to invade other countries, get our troops killed toppling foreign leaders, or enlist the Marines in defending the profits of U.S. multinationals? Perish the thought.

In fact, Pentagon bureaucrats want no restrictions on their freedom to subsidize the merchants of death at public expense. They react to arms controls like social workers to a tax revolt. But as the founders knew, limiting government power means curbing the tools of power.

Benjamin Rush, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, proposed in 1792 that two mottoes be written above the entrance to the War Department: "An office for butchering the human species" and "A Widow and Orphan making office." It's never been more apropos. RRR

Dear *Triple R:*
Start sending me (or renew) your newsletter:
❑ $49 for 1-year; ❑ $98 for 2-years; ❑ $147 for 3-years.
❑ Enclosed is my tax-deductible contribution (made out to CLS).
❑ Send information to the friends I've listed on a separate sheet.

Credit card number: _____

Signature: _____ Exp. Date _____

Or phone 1-800-325-7257 for VISA, Amex, or MasterCard charges.

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ State _____ ZIP _____

Triple R, Center for Libertarian Studies, P.O. Box 4091, Burlingame, CA 94011

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED